

Agenda – Sept 14, 2006

On line:

Tony Forti
Brian Toal
Sharee Rusnak
Gary Buchanan
Joe Sekerke
Paul South
Eric Frohmberg

Changes/Comments to Discuss:

Full Report:

GARY: Do new DE numbers change any of the figures.

Gary: Inconsistency in Hudson numbers – does my email clarify it?

Discussed emails back and forth and decided to change references to the table to clarify – Eric will do.

Tony - by the way, we have new data – average 3.8 ppm if you include the one with 116 ppm PCBs in striped bass. All up at Troy. (general amazement from group)

Eric – Decided to draw the line in terms of including data – we'll have to leave that out for this discussion.

Eric – find bio ref to adult females breeding w/out males

Eric – mention size distinction re: migrating females.

Eric will fix this – the issue is that migratory fish that are over regulation size are virtually all females, some males do migrate. Two places where that is important – one is Maine and the other is Chesapeake Bay – Jack pointed out that still not an important number of males migrating.

Deb/Health Effects Group: Add data on adult health – strike issue of risk level.

Brian - Gary Ginsberg and I were looking at the conclusions – in particular the effect from easing up on the advice for some state for the general population from 1 meal per month from 1 meal every other month. Wherever the consensus advisory takes us, we'd like to add something stating that this advisory means we will have a cancer risk of "blah".

Gary – I think that is a good point, but what assumptions do you use?

Eric – my concern as well.

Brian - Let the tox group work it out.

Brian – Gary G. will volunteer and I'll talk to Deb. Eric think about where it will go –
Eric votes the conclusions.

Virginia – confirm 30 ED for advice?

South Carolina – confirm 50% cooking loss and exposure duration.

Florida – exposure duration

Joe – doesn't have any advice for PCBs. Typically use 70yrs.

Tony – Salama et al. 1988 – 55% or 56% cooking loss. confirm.

Tony has the wrong reference – will correct. **Done**

Conclusions:

Last paragraph of intro – changes ok?

Eric –

Jack – comments. sent – didn't get comments. By and large – written to be general, not to single out one or more factors. and connote them as being barriers. Since I sent If you want discuss things as barriers. Jack didn't see any appropriateness in changing it. I do have an issue with looking at some of those issues as barriers. I think the way it is going about is may or may not comport fully with the introduction.

Gary is comfortable with either version.. If second version, just smooth out. Ditto for Ct. Brian likes the new Paragraph.

Jack – have been in touch with MA public health – thinks there will be problems with adoption of advice. Both marine fisheries and public health thinks the current advice is adequate.

Brian – who are you talking to :??

Jack Asst commissioner – further information about lack of balance about benefits.

Brian this is not a fact sheet about general public. .

Eric - Two different things in Risk communciation section – one is when report is released should be press release. number 2 – if a number of states come up with a consistent advisory, then mention again in a release.

Then those states that do agree, can do so. We have always said not all states will sign on to this.

Jack – when will this be posted on the web?

Eric – The hope is to wrap this up this fall.

So... for the change to the last paragraph? Who wants to keep the original vs. change.

Jack – keep original

Gary change

Sharee change

Eric Change.

Will be changed.

So, will keep change – if so, any changes to text?

What about “barrier” of commercial fish?

Gary G and Brian discussed – except for some areas along the coast, not a common commercial fish – most of the supermarkets, not an issue.

Agreed- will drop – not worth opening that can of worms, and this process focused on recreational fish.

Insert something re: general population health effects after changes to Tox chapter.

health effects will do.

Comments from Ct – size cutoffs in bluefish advice....discuss – in some ways a broader issue re: striped bass....

Gary - Generally don't most states suggest eating smaller younger fish of legal size? Not consistently.

Eric - What about Ashok's data.

Gary – They reflected the waters they were in – if they were higher they were in the hudson, etc. the concentrations were relatively low in most areas.

Gary and Rick looked at some of the data on a size basis – and came up with the 14” cutoff in the Delaware bay.

tony – sort of a big issue. don't know if you want to at this late date. IF you want to get into it – do as an appendix?

Jack – any idea about the catch and landings for bluefish – I know that it varies from state to state.

Brian – no doubt bluefish are kept and eaten. At this late date, difficult to get agreement. IF we acknowledge. Ct. feels pretty strongly about it – smaller fish are much less contaminated. For Ct. we'd adopt the consistent advice, with this issue tagged on. Some states may deem to have a less restrictive advice.

Eric So, we will add this issue as something to discuss when we get more data?:

Brian – probably will get one crack at coming up with consistent advice. Brian would like to push for this opportunity.

Brian – we could argue that PCBs in bluefish are relatively the same from striped bass and that there is some value in consistency.

Tony – we haven't demonstrated that in LI – wouldn't apply in certain limited situations. Jack – show me the data that would support that.

Brian - We aren't saying that striped bass are the same as bluefish in the LI sound. but we are saying it from a coastwide basis. On average it works.

Jack can't support this idea due to the lack of numbers.

Brian - This group is highly unlikely to get this group together again. If the rationale is lack of data to issue an advisory, then you can always make the recommendation to not issue an advisory.

Tony – it is a good thing to leave in, but needs to be qualified. The thing about consistency – it may make sense.

DECISION: Leave this section as is.

Brian – one more thing – what about young boys. We feel uncomfortable about excluding them from the sensitive group. We could address in our own literature. from a risk comm level – won't go over if can say 4 year old boys Concern about cancer risks in young boys. Reflect uncertainty and doesn't look good from a risk communication perspective. Maybe better to hold off rather than try to tackle.

Tony – hard time seeing defining the sensitive pop as not including young boys.

Decided not to include in this paper.

Conclusions – did I hit the major points we want to emphasize?

Brian – thought captured. Gary – agrees.

Last paragraph – blech – something a little lesswishy washy?

Will the last paragraph do?

Looks fine.

Next Steps –

One more set of revisions? =- yes – and eric will post.

Front Matter?

Executive Summary – Sharee and Brian will get started on that.

Clean up References

NEXT MEETING.

Thursday October 19th. 2 PM